

is no county society that can not afford to help to this extent at least. It is just one of our duties; let us do it.

Many things emanate from Chicago. One of them happens to be a medical journal published by a manufacturing house and  
**THOUGHT** mainly devoted to urging the  
**STIMULUS.** use of a particular form of medication. In the May number of this particular journal (*Clinical Medicine*, one time *Abbott's Alkoloidal Clinic*) the editor devotes considerable space to the CALIFORNIA STATE JOURNAL OF MEDICINE, and, incidentally, referring to our pages, says that "there is no dearth of thought stimulus in them." We are certainly profoundly grateful—and somewhat amused. "Thought stimulus" is what both manufacturers and medical (?) journals desire to avoid, for if the physician readers got to thinking about things—as they are doing now—the result would not be exactly what the manufacturers want, and the medical (?) journals would be deprived of some exceedingly dirty revenue. Indeed, it is the question of revenue derived from advertising which seems to be most prominently in the mind of the editor in question, for he constantly refers to it and the attitude of the STATE JOURNAL on that question. One of his utterances is truly the most startling thing that has thus far appeared in print:

"There are certain eternal, fundamental principles of right and wrong, however, which should govern everybody; but advertising is not based upon such fundamental principles."

Now, just stop and think about that; let it roll about in your head and come in contact with your gray matter. Advertising, according to this editorial utterance, has nothing to do with right and wrong! Our editorial contemporary admits with a wonderful charity and honesty that "there are certain fundamental principles of right and wrong" which should guide us in everything—except advertising. Why not be guided by "fundamental principles of right and wrong," even in advertising? Can it be that the editorial conscience is active in every direction—except advertising? Can there be a mundane and lowly reason for this peculiar editorial belief that right and wrong, as fundamental principles, do not apply to advertising? Possibly this is so, for when we come to scan the advertising pages of our wonderful contemporary we find a number of exceedingly strange things presented to the attention of the reader—and paid for by the

advertiser, we presume. We find that this medical (?) journal aids the daily press in assisting the manufacturers to sell sundry articles; and one of these is mentioned in the song that has been going the rounds: "What's I goin' to do? What's I goin' to say? I done tole yu' 'bout dat whirlin' spray!" As further argument to guide the editorial conscience in believing that right and wrong have nothing to do with advertising, we find (in addition to that of the "whirling spray") the—presumably paid for—advertisements of numerous fakes, frauds and nostrums. Now, if these concerns were paying you, as an editor and proprietor of a medical (?) publication many hundreds of dollars a year to help them fake the medical profession, what would *you* think about the advertising question? Would *you* believe that "there are certain eternal, fundamental principles of right and wrong, however, which should govern everybody; but advertising is not based upon such fundamental principles"?

It is refreshing to find a trade journal with sufficient common honesty to believe that "the fundamental principles which govern right and wrong" should not be forgotten, and to tell the truth about things as it

sees them. The *Canadian Pharmaceutical Journal*, in a recent issue, referred to the unmasking of "antikamnia," "phenalgine," "ammonol," etc., by the Pure Food and Drugs Act. It will be recalled that "phenalgine" was one of the acetanilide preparation shown up by the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry, and that the manufacturers scared off most of the medical journals in the country from publishing the report, by threatening a libel suit. (By the way, this threatened libel suit business is getting to be very tiresome; at first it was amusing, but now it is merely wearisome.) Acetanilide being one of the component parts of the preparations mentioned, and it being one of the things which the law says the label shall tell about, we find that the "antikamnia" label now states that the preparation contains 350 grains of phenacetin to the ounce. "Ammonol," another one of those wonderful "new and improved chemicals," is found to contain 240 grains of phenacetin, while "phenalgine" is branded as containing 50 per cent acetanilide. These facts are respectfully referred to those distinguished gentlemen who, in spite of all that has been said, continue or continued until a short time ago, to use some of these outrageous fakes. Truly,

there do seem to be a considerable number of people in the world who like to be lied to; it is astonishing, but apparently true.

### REPORT OF THE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS.\*

By DUDLEY TAIT, San Francisco.

The policy pursued by the Board of Examiners during the past two years has not deviated from that outlined in Riverside. The strictest adherence to the law has characterized every decision, every move, every act. "Better no law at all than one which is not enforced," has been our motto. You may scan our records, peruse our archives, and you will find none of the nambypamby methods so prevalent in many official bodies. Two subjects in particular have occupied the attention of the Board and called for special study: First, the preliminary educational requirements of matriculants to the medical schools of this State; second, the framing of a new medical law.

A year ago the Association of American Medical Colleges, at the urgent request of the Credential Committee of the California Board, placed the control of the matriculation requirements exclusively in the hands of the State Boards, thus killing a prevailing mercenary traffic in entrance certificates, so profitably and so complaisantly arranged by deputy State superintendents and two medical schools. To-day we wish to report to you the results of the enforcement of the new regulation in the matter of matriculation requirements. The 1905-6 session of one of the colleges just referred to opened with forty-two Freshman students, the majority of whom presented certificates from a Deputy State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The following year, when the Board appointed an examiner to pass upon the credentials of matriculants, the requirements being the same as the year previous, this same school has seven students in the Freshman class, and four of these are not legally entitled to remain there, inasmuch as they have not met the proper entrance requirements. Therefore, we note a reduction of 1400% in the matriculation record of this college. In the second school the 1905-6 session opened with ten Freshmen; the following year we fail to find a single Freshman. The enforcement of the Association standard has closed the doors of this college.

There is no more radical method of exterminating the purely mercenary medical college than by exacting of all matriculants a high standard of preliminary education. The California Board extends its investigation of preliminary requirements to every applicant for a certificate to practice medicine. We have already notified several large Eastern colleges of this fact.

A few words now in regard to the new medical law. Those who framed that excellent law which regulated the practice of medicine in this State from 1876 to 1901 knew well the great value of their creation, but unfortunately those upon whom fell the duty of enforcing this law neglected, at an early date, to study the law, and then apparently ignored or failed to enforce its most potent sections. Consequently in 1901 a new law was found necessary, and a fabulous price paid for its enactment. The price was the Osteopathic Act, a cheap, almost open door to the practice of medicine. How has this medical law operated during the past six years? We note an annual reduction of 25% of the regular licentiates, who now average 180 yearly, a reduc-

tion of 400% of the homeopathic licentiates, who average ten yearly, and finally a reduction of 1700 of the Eclectic licentiates, who now average about two yearly. The trend of thought among educated homeopaths is toward rational or scientific methods. Here in California they are advocating high educational standards, and we find them invariably among the strongest supporters of our medical law. Eclecticism is ready for the necropsy table. But let us now contemplate the reverse side of the medal and estimate what we have foisted upon the unsuspecting people of this State. About 800 licenses have been granted by the California Osteopathic Board of Examiners since 1901. At the recent February meeting of said Board a block of 170 licenses was issued—i. e., almost as many as the Medical Board issues during an entire year. And let us not forget that all these osteopathic licenses, with one exception, were granted without examination. Among the successful applicants before the Osteopathic Board we find a considerable and increasing proportion of applicants who failed ignominiously before the Medical Board. The sole licentiate by examination at the hands of the Osteopathic Board presented a worthless German certificate purporting to be a medical diploma from the University of Heidelberg. Perhaps the osteopaths' ignorance of the Teutonic tongue may seem pardonable, when shortly afterwards we find the same spurious certificate admitting its holder to advanced standing in a regular medical school of medicine in San Francisco.

Pardon, I pray you, this digression, and let us return to our muttons, the osteopaths. During the recent meeting of the Legislature the osteopathic delegation stated, without compulsion, that their licentiates practiced medicine, surgery and the various specialties, resorting to drugs and to the knife whenever necessary. "Their ambition," said they, "was to be known as practitioners of medicine, in the broad sense of the term." It is therefore obvious that the present medical law has made the requirements much more rigid for our own followers, while it has created a wide door through which the illiterate entered the practice of medicine. The evil was flagrant. Our medical law was suicidal, although constitutionally sound. A new law became imperative. Hence the law which takes effect May 1st, a law in the framing of which liberality has been the dominant note. The new law may not be ideal, but the perusal of the decisions of the Supreme Courts of other States justifies us in asserting that it will successfully run the gamut of judiciary bodies, of California. To those who view with a feeling of suspicion, any association with the osteopathic fold, I say have patience; let us await the result of the experiment, which according to recent experience is one of assimilation. Let history repeat itself, we must not forget the absurdities and follies of our ancient quarrel over pathies.

Whence will the new law conduct us? No law is self-operative. Isolated, sporadic enthusiasm must succumb to general apathy. I sincerely believe it is within our power to advance the cause of medical education, to ameliorate the status and lighten the burden of the practitioner of medicine in this State; but a happy sloution of the serious problems confronting us will require active intelligent co-operation. The influence for good, the power of this society, is just proportionate to the degree of initiative and willingness of its average member.

A final word in reference to the prosecution of illegal practitioners, which, under the new law, may become one of the Board's functions. In many States the enforcement of the criminal statute is delegated by the Legislature to the State Society. The California law makes us your agents in this matter; hence the urgent reason for the co-operation of the State and County Societies with the Board of Ex-

\*Read at the Thirty-seventh Annual Meeting of the Medical Society of the State of California, held at Del Monte, April 16th, 17th and 18th, 1907.